| | Case 2:23-cv-00672-DC-JDP Documen | t 42 Filed 07/18/25 Page 1 of 2 |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | JULIAN VAUGHN, | No. 2:23-cv-00672-DC-JDP (PS) |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING |
| 13 | v. | PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE |
| 14 | NICKOLAS TATAR, et al., | (Doc. Nos. 36, 40) |
| 15 | Defendants. | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Plaintiff Julian Vaughn is proceeding pro se in this civil action. This matter was referred | |
| 18 | to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. | |
| 19 | On February 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion to strike statements made by Defendants in | |
| 20 | their answer to Plaintiff's complaint and in Defendants' counterclaim. (Doc. No. 36.) On April | |
| 21 | 29, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that | |
| 22 | Plaintiff's motion to strike be denied as frivolous. (Doc. No. 40.) Specifically, the magistrate | |
| 23 | judge found Plaintiff's motion was untimely, his reliance on provisions of the California Code of | |
| 24 | Civil Procedure were not applicable in this federal action, and his arguments were substantively | |
| 25 | unconvincing. (Id. at 2.) The pending findings and recommendations were served on the parties | |
| 26 | and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after | |
| 27 | service. (<i>Id.</i> at 3.) To date, no objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed, | |
| 28 | and the time in which to do so has passed. | |
| | | 1 |

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a 1 2 de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the 3 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. 4 Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 29, 2025 (Doc. No. 40) are 5 6 ADOPTED in full; 7 2. Plaintiff's motion to strike (Doc. No. 36) is DENIED; 8 3. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further 9 proceedings. 10 11 IT IS SO ORDERED. 12 Dated: **July 17, 2025** 13 **Dena Coggins** 14 United States District Judge 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Document 42

Filed 07/18/25

Page 2 of 2

Case 2:23-cv-00672-DC-JDP